

**BRAC Cleanup Team HPNS Meeting Agenda**  
**Sept 9, 2021**  
**Conference Call**

**Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**

**9:00am – 11am**

**Agenda**

**1. Introductions (Derek Robinson)**

**Navy** – Derek, Brooks, Paul, Sean-Ryan, Sharon, Wilson, Leslie, Thomas, Heather

**EPA** – Wayne, Maeve, Yolanda, John, and Karen

**DTSC/CDPH** – Nina, Kim and Michael Howley (new RPM)/T Terry

**Waterboard** – Phyllis, David,

**City of SF** – Amy and Dustine (Langdon)

**2. Navy Business/Action Items (Derek Robinson)**

**#2 F-WBZ Work Plan Meeting** – Karen noted this meeting was supposed to happen in November 2020, per a commitment as part of the informal dispute. Yolanda mentioned there seemed to be a one-sided approach to the action item comments and Karen suggested editing it.

**#3 Signs** – Navy said they post signs every 100 feet from Yosemite Slough to Crisp Road. In the last month, there has been 17 new signs placed. There is a site walk to check the fenceline and signs 2-3 times a week. The property signs only say “Navy property: Keep out.”

**#4 Comm Evaluation** – Derek will send this soon.

**#5 ACM as part of the remedy?** DTSC is looking at adding this to the current LUC, because it would be different than language already drafted. Brooks agreed that the remedy wouldn't be changing, but the administrative control might be changed. Thomas says that adding a COC would not necessarily be a change to the remedy. John reminded folks the durable cover is for metals and doesn't speak to asbestos. Nina mentioned asbestos is already a COC at the site (naturally-occurring). John said ACM was not part of the original remedy. He is not agreeing to a non-remedy change at this point and requests more information on the topic. Nina suggested there needs to be a meeting about this topic. Derek suggested this could be addressed in the RACR or during LUC discussions. Nina suggested the discussion needs to be before that, because all the regulatory agencies might not be in agreement this is not a remedy change. Amy noted the LUC RD is finalized in 2018 and would need to be changed.

**#6 TPH cleanup activities** – Sharon noted the petroleum cleanup is slated by April 2026.

**3. Document tracking (Navy)**

**PFAS** – The Navy will provide RTCs on 9/13 and said they will be extending an extension request. Brooks said Navy got the tri-agency letter yesterday afternoon and looks forward to setting up a meeting. She noted the draft final date will likely be extended.

**Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report** – We will provide joint comments with Waterboard by 9/17.

**Parcel B RAWP Building 123 at IR10** – Draft workplan sent 9/6

**Parcel C RAMR** – We will provide joint comments with Waterboard by 9/17

**Parcel D-1 RACSR** – Odd deletion on DTM, EPA/Waterboard already provided a position on the draft final RACSR and recommended the Navy attach the letter to the final RACSR. The black mark on the DTM is to meet EPA's request to eliminate the date from the schedule. Karen thanked the Navy for being responsive and mentioned this wasn't the only RACR to change to a RACSR. How will this be consistent? Brooks said she would work with Jamie.

**Parcel E2 Post** – Remedial Action Study WP expected in October, with a presentation today.

**Parcel F ROD** – Draft final tentatively scheduled for 9/30 (EPA's recommendation to move back from 9/10).

**Parcel F tech memo** – EPA/DTSC/Waterboard joint comments sent asking for a modification to the tech memo (which will take time and the Navy is pushing back). The tech memo increased monitoring natural recovery (MNR) duration by 7 years, and the agencies asked the Navy to study options to shorten the time (as they are adjacent to Yosemite Slough). Meeting scheduled on 9/16 to discuss agency comments. Navy received the comments on the tech memo and noted a meeting next week (9/16) and noted the Parcel F ROD draft might be issued at the end of the month. John noted the reg agencies asked for more work to be done as part of the tech memo. Brooks mentioned the Navy is trying to be responsive to the reg agencies request to keep this moving quickly.

### **Radiological rework**

- Health and safety survey This date of 9/16 will be extended
- Parcel B draft final rework workplan (do we expect another draft final?)
- Parcel C draft final rework workplan (extended to 9/20)
- Parcel E draft final rework workplan (how can we get our Parcel B edits included?)

The Navy is anticipating getting Parcels C and E WPs out these out this month. Wayne noted the timing of the Parcel C and Parcel E draft "is not the most efficient way to do things, either for the agencies or for the Navy" either to get a resolution of our comments integrated into future workplans. We have noted some significant changes in the Parcel B workplan that has not yet been resolved. Paul noted he could talk with the team to see if there needs to be changes to the chronology of these forthcoming drafts.

## **4. Fieldwork Updates (Navy)**

Paul mentioned for the radiological building fieldwork, the Navy continues to work with EPA to ensure the instrument sensitivity can meet the risk modeling needs.

## **5. Parcel C DNAPL Pilot Test (Navy)**

Navy sent an April 19 tech memo and wanted to set-up a meeting. However, the Navy didn't contract the work out in the expected time. The DNAPL is primarily TCE and

diesel and gasoline, sitting beneath building 253 (shown in the 2019 RAWP Addendum and April 19 tech memo). The Navy wished to conduct thermal as a remedy without implementing an ESD or ROD amendment. Using only the ROD remedy (in situ injections) will not meet the RAOs in appropriate time.

## 6. Parcel E-2 Overview (Navy)

This project is to evaluate the upland slurry wall and respond to regulatory agency concerns about the obstruction found in the field during remedial action.

Travis Williamson (Battelle) provided a presentation of the current plan. The objective is to characterize the obstruction and assess whether it acts as an extension of the upland slurry wall to allow the RAOs to be met.

Karen mentioned EPA is not in a position to respond today, as we just received the information. Karen asked what the deliverable will be; Travis said the workplan is first. This work plan will outline the approach to evaluate the obstruction. The report on the back-end of the fieldwork would be another deliverable. Karen asked if Battelle received a copy of the joint path forward letter from the regulatory agencies and other information about hydrogeology and conceptual site model. Travel said yes.

Karen noted the concern of whether this should have been addressed at the time the obstruction was encountered, as part of the FFA process. **Karen also suggested another focused technical meeting might need to be hosted.** Derek disagreed that a change in fieldwork, based on surprises, needs to be addressed at that time. He noted the contractors moved forward to install the upland slurry wall as best they could. Karen mentioned the regulatory agencies should have been notified when this occurred, at a minimum.

Nina noted she believed the workplan would include groundwater monitoring as another line of evidence that the upland slurry wall is working. In the end, the regulatory agencies will require groundwater monitoring and it seems more time efficient to include it as part of the work plan. Derek noted it was part of the discussion with Battelle. However, because the remedy isn't solely the upland slurry wall, collecting groundwater monitoring data "is premature" as other pieces of the groundwater remedy will help achieve RAOs. Later on, groundwater samples will be collected. Travel noted groundwater samples are being collected as part of the basewide groundwater monitoring program. The French drain is a problem and an important component of the remedy, as is the landfill cover. All of these elements need to be in place, working together, to fully assess the remedy's overall performance. Leslie mentioned "it has not been connected with the upland wetland" in order to notice the change. Nina mentioned the French drain is surface water, whereas the upland slurry wall is focused on groundwater. Travis said the groundwater elevation data is being collected and can be reviewed, but we are in the construction phase of a four-phase remedial action; therefore, the information would only be preliminary. Conditions will change as other elements of the remedy is completed, including groundwater elevation and even groundwater flow.

## 7. Miscellaneous Topics/Updates

**Navy's Quality Assurance Office is understaffed at the moment.** They have hired but won't be fully staffed for another month or so. Many documents require a review of the

SAP and the signature of the QA office in order to go out. So, there might be some delays.

**BAAQMD convening with agencies working in Bayview Hunters Point** – In mid-June, BAAQMD sent a letter to Mayor Breed and Supervisor Walton about convening a discussion with agencies working in BVHP community. Air district cc'ed staff-level HPNS site team members at EPA, DTSC, and the Navy and has subsequently reached out to us about a meeting scheduled on September 29. So, I wanted to ensure this request was on the Navy's radar. DTSC is planning on attending and sending a manager. Derek will attend for the Navy.

**BAAQMD connected to EPA about Navy's air monitoring/dust control plan** –

**June 3, 2021 BCT meeting notes** –The June 3 meeting summary included a fine level of detail on only one discussion – which was the miscellaneous action item on groundwater monitoring and Parcel C groundwater wells. We find this to be inconsistent with the meeting summary approach; additionally, the summary only seemed to reflect the Navy's role in the discussion. It's really not appropriate. We are asking the Navy to strike most of the text from the summary and redistribute an updated draft before finalizing. Nina agreed and offered to send a redline strike.

In late 2019, we had many discussions about the level of detail to include in the BCT meeting summaries. In those discussions the Navy was *insistent* the meeting summaries are not detailed minutes, but a high-level summary of the discussion. We agreed these would be a summary and be factual and as detailed as necessary to appropriately capture the essence of the discussion. Since, the meeting summaries have been a good balance.

## **8. Community Outreach**

**Virtual open house meeting** – Derek mentioned Parcel G data through February is only provided. Something about validated data and data not collected during the rainy season. The Navy will answer questions that are submitted one-on-one. If a question is asked a few times, they will post an FAQ on the website.

Yolanda asked about the Navy's decision to not have a Q&A session. Derek mentioned there wasn't a lot of new information, plus the upcoming HPS CAC meeting upcoming (October), office hours with Dr. Higley, and December community meeting. Yolanda asked how many people participated in the live Q&A session in March and Liz said 16 community members in session #1 and 12 in session #2. Certain number of people asked multiple questions. Nina agreed it is disappointing there is not a live Q&A session and wondered if it should be considered a public meeting. Derek mentioned there is opportunity to provide comments at each station. Yolanda asked the Navy to do a complete FAQ session, not one just focused on certain questions.

Derek mentioned questions about Strontium-90 might be asked at the October 25 HPS CAC meeting.

**DTSC got an ABC news interview request on sea-level rise** – Navy did not receive an email.

### **Michael Boyd's Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc (CARE) concerns on dust –**

Mr. Boyd reached out to our HQ office with photos on bulldozers onsite without “water trucks” and a desire to contact BAAQMD on this issue. EPA responded by noting the photos included work onsite (that BAAQMD would not have jurisdiction) and the photos did not show any violations as they did not show any dust. We recommended Mr. Boyd reach out to Derek Robinson for questions about the status of air monitoring or dust controls. Derek said he did get an email in and responded with the fact sheet on dust.

**EPA OLEM AA/PEER + others meeting** – In August, the Office of Land and Emergency Management's (OLEM) Acting Assistant Administrator Carlton Waterhouse hosted a listening session with external groups interested in the site, which included Jeff Ruch from Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER), Dan Hirsch from the Committee to Bridge the Gap, Michelle Pierce from the Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates (a community-based group), and a few local university professors. The Region 9 site team participated in the meeting.

At the meeting, Mr. Waterhouse committed EPA to respond. There were six concerns raised, which we plan to respond to:

1. Soil Cleanup Standards (use BPRG Calculator default values and  $10^{-6}$  risk)
2. Building Cleanup Standards (use BPRG Calculator default values and  $10^{-6}$  risk)
3. Comprehensive Site-wide Sampling for Radionuclides (not scanning)
4. Sandblast Grit
5. Genuine & Meaningful Community Involvement (Community Oversight Committee)
6. Oversight Failures

We have already responded to #5 about community involvement, noting the Navy is the lead agency and we have had continuous requests over the years for the Navy to reflect on the importance of an inclusive community outreach and involvement program. We pointed to our August 27, 2020, letter asked the Navy to perform a comprehensive evaluation of its community outreach and involvement program. And, we stated that the Navy is beginning this evaluation process. Additionally, Carlton personally committed to connect with the Navy about the need for a comprehensive evaluation of its community involvement activities.

Nina asked for EPA to share our responses; I committed to share something as we respond.

### **9. Future Meetings/Action Items**

### **10. Adjourn BCT Meeting**